

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/927,901	LEMAY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aaron L Enatsky	3713	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Aaron L Enatsky.

(3) David Olynick.

(2) Mike O'Neill.

(4) Keith Moore.

Date of Interview: 16 March 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



MICHAEL O'NEILL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the instant invention, described the invention as related to prior art of record, and discussed possible claim amendments to further clarify the invention. Specifically, Applicant discussed the differences in the instant invention relating to pre-rendered images versus real time rendering of images. This will require a further search and additional evaluation of the existing prior art. Applicant's comments will be fully considered and taken under advisement when considering an amendment .